

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILI	ING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/054,487 01/22/2002		/22/2002	Brian Lauman	112713-147	5579	
29200 7590 07/21/2005			EXAM	EXAMINER		
		ARE CORPO	FRANK, R	FRANK, RODNEY T		
1 BAXTER PARKWAY DF2-2E DEERFIELD, IL 60015				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				2856		

DATE MAILED: 07/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	<del>- 11/( -</del>
	10/054,487	LAUMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Rodney T. Frank	2856	
ı		ł	l

• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •							
	Rodney T. Frank	2856					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>30 June 2005</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APF	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.					
this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant	The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following						
time periods:  a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	e of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	06.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ice action; or (2) as				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com	pliance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be	filed within two month	ns of the date of				
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed	ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	ne appeal. Since				
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>							
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief	, will <u>not</u> be entered b	ecause				
<ul> <li>(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co</li> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below)</li> </ul>		TE Delow),					
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be		educina or simplifyina	the issues for				
appeal; and/or	tto, form for appear by materially to	, a a a , a , , , ,					
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	jected claims.					
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s							
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	llowable if submitted in a separate,						
7. Solution For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proposed. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ill be entered and an	explanation of				
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-20 and 23-73</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>21 and 22</u> . <u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u>							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	ut before or on the date of filing a N nd sufficient reasons why the affida	lotice of Appeal will <u>n</u> vit or other evidence i	ot be entered s necessary and				
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessa</li> </ol>	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe ry and was not earlier presented. S	eal and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(	ils to provide a 1).				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
11.   The request for reconsideration has been considered b  See Continuation Sheet.	ut does NOT place the application i	in condition for allowa	ince because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).  13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper	No(s)					
10. — Outon							
•	•						

## **Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)**

Continuation of 3. NOTE: the specifics of the flexible membrane receptacle, at a minimum, are new matter and would require further consideration.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the applicant stated that the finality of the previous action should be withdrawn since the claim amendments were within the scope of the invention and were merely to clarify the present invention and point out deficiencies of the Rogers reference used in the initial non-final action. The examiner disagrees because the applicants amendments narrowed the claims by, for example, specifying where the fluid receptacle is placed in reference to the capacitor plates, and defining a space between the plates, such that the plates are not, for example, one atop the other or in a parallel planar relationship, as in some systems. These limitations narrow the claim and are reasons necessary to change the grounds of rejection and thus make the rejection final. The finality of the previous rejection is deemed to be proper is being maintained.

7(13/0)

THOMAS P. NOLAND
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 2000